



Forward Thinking, High Achieving.

**Missoula County Public Schools
Title I Standing Committee**

Tuesday, March 4, 2014

6:00 to 7:30 PM

Administration Building

215 South Sixth Street West, Room 24

Committee Members: Tara Barba, Brian Bessette, Heather Davis Schmidt, Amanda Dellwo, Brian Fortmann, Leslie Gallant, Lori Grant, Terry Jarvis, Sindie Kennedy, Tracy Ledyard, Wendy Melvin, Stephanie Morrow, Matt Quinlan, Erica Ramsey, Julie Robitaille, David Rott, Joy Seymour and Shannan Sproull.

Absent: Brian Bessette and Terry Jarvis.

Guiding Question:

How do we assure the MCPS Title I program best meets the needs of students and families?

Long term target:

Align Title I goals, programming and budgets to the Federal requirements, MCPS district, Graduation Matters and 21st Century Model of Education goals.

Short term targets:

- Review Community Advisory Committee purpose
- Review collective commitments for collaborative work
- Review current Free & Reduced Meals data
- Review High School Feeder School data
- Review draft 2014-15 K-8 and high school budgets
- Identify next meeting date.

AGENDA

6:00 – 6:25	Welcome, dinner, view video: Myth of Average The community viewed the video, Myth of Average while eating dinner.
6:25 – 6:30	Review agenda and review Community Advisory Committee purpose. Reviewed agenda and the guiding question. Heather reminded the group that this is an advisory committee that provides feedback on programming. We are not a committee that makes any recommendations to the Board of Trustees. The group that meets during the Title I Meeting of Practitioners on March 21 makes any programmatic recommendations to the Board. There was a question about the inclusion of non-Title I schools at the meeting. Heather suggested we could have a table for non-Title I FIT coordinators and principals, if there is an interest to attend.
6:30 – 6:35	Review Collective Commitments for Collaborative Work. Reviewed Commitments for Collaborative Work.

<p>6:35 – 6:40</p>	<p>Review Free & Reduced Meals data – Heather Davis Schmidt</p> <p>Heather reviewed the Five Year Free & Reduced Meals data that reflects changes in the data for each school in the district over the past five years. She explained this data is used to determine the level of poverty in each building. The data is based on the families that complete the application and submit it to the district.</p> <p>The Free & Reduced Meals data is important because Hellgate has fallen below the 35% threshold. Big Sky and Seeley-Swan High Schools have experienced increases in their percentage of students receiving free or reduced-priced meals. This forces us to discontinue Hellgate’s Title I funding at this time. A committee member asked if Hellgate could receive a smaller amount of funding. Heather explained the funding is “all or nothing,” meaning there is not an option to provide a smaller amount of Title I funds to Hellgate. She stressed that conversations about this change have occurred with the Hellgate team over the past year. Hellgate’s Title I funding was also discussed at length last year.</p>
<p>6:40 – 6:45</p>	<p>Review High School Feeder School Data – Heather Davis Schmidt</p> <p>This committee explored the Feeder Pattern as a funding strategy where we would look at feeder school F&R data from the schools that feed into the high schools. We presented both funding strategies to this committee and to the participants at the annual Title I Meeting of Practitioners. This committee and participants at the Title I Meeting of Practitioners participated in the same feedback process. Data from the feedback received from participants in both groups was analyzed and made available to members of both groups. This data was also presented to the Superintendent’s Cabinet and to the Board of Trustees. The data reflected an overwhelming feeling that the best representation of poverty in the high schools was the F&R data from the schools – not the feeder school data. Because the high school district is open enrollment, the number of students that do not go to their boundary school skews the data and is not an accurate representation. As such, it was determined by the Superintendent’s Cabinet and the Board of Trustees to continue using the building Free & Reduced Meals percentages and not the Feeder Pattern funding strategy.</p> <p>Tara Barba asked if the feeder pattern data is from last year. Heather explained it is last year’s data because the district’s data manager retired and has not been replaced yet. Tara asked for this year’s data. Heather offered to get this data as soon as a data manager is hired. Tara thought the feeder school data was valuable.</p> <p>Knowing that the F&R numbers were declining at Hellgate, Matt Quinlan and Tracy Ledyard have worked very hard to reach out and identify families that qualify for F&R eligibility. Despite this, the percentage is still below 35%.</p> <p>The committee also reviewed the Free & Reduced Meals data based on high school grades. The data possibly reflects that families with students in the the younger grades might be more willing to complete the F&R application. It may also indicate there is more poverty with the younger students. A committee member suggested</p>

	<p>drop outs could also impact the percentages. Regardless, these data demonstrate that Big Sky's F&R numbers have increased significantly.</p> <p>Because Big Sky is over the 40% threshold for the second year in a row, they are eligible to apply for Title I Schoolwide status. This will not result in more money but it will give them more flexibility in service delivery.</p> <p>Amanda asked if Hellgate's Title I services are all going way. She felt Tracy's role as an FRC coordinator and social worker is critical. Amanda refers many people to Tracy. Heather explained Tracy is not leaving. She will still work as a social worker and will work as a FIT coordinator.</p> <p>Tara asked if this change to Hellgate's Title I program has been communicated to parents. She thought it was important to inform parents that Title I funding will go away next year. Heather agreed and will make sure that communication happens.</p> <p>Heather explained it doesn't matter if someone is F&R eligible or not to receive Title I interventions. The services are still expected to happen at Hellgate. They just won't receive the funding for "above and beyond" interventions. Tara explained there is so much emphasis on Graduation Matters that she is concerned that the discussion has not happened, that there is a safety net being removed. Heather explained there is no safety net. All schools receive the same funding. Title I is above and beyond funding. Students that are identified as FIT or Neglected & Delinquent do still receive services.</p> <p>Dave Rott explained Chief Charlo was a targeted school for a couple of years. They designated 2 full time teachers to work with eligible students. When they lost Title I funding, they had to come up with different strategies. They formed committees and explored different ways to provide academic services. The RTI model was implemented.</p> <p>Heather explained we no longer have the ability to legally give the funding to Hellgate. We will still provide for those students.</p> <p>Julie asked how many Title I FTE are at Hellgate. Heather explained there are two full-time teachers and one half-time FRC coordinator that are funded by Title I. She stated she is working with Human Resources to work through the process of re-assigning the staff members.</p> <p>Heather explained that the amount of money going to the Federal Government and then to the state and then to us doesn't change. This will mean that Big Sky will get more funding which will allow some reallocation of staffing FTE.</p>
6:45 – 7:10	<p>Draft 2014-15 K-8 and high school budgets – Heather Davis Schmidt</p> <p>Dave asked about Title I funding for Paxson. He noticed they are above the district average. Discussion ensued about including Paxson. Heather suggested we are not ready to include Paxson. They will need to get closer to the higher percentages -</p>

	<p>schools that are being served.</p> <p>Heather explained we have decided to focus our funding on those schools with the highest poverty. She explained that Paxson is one of her schools and she wants to see them get some additional support. Last year we looked at adding Paxson as a Targeted Title I school. They would have received a small allocation. This had an funding impact on the other buildings. It has an impact on other resources, such as the instructional coaches and FRC coordinator salaries. It seems like a small impact but it really dilutes the resources. If Paxson is a school that is going back and forth, we need to keep the funding with the highest poverty schools.</p> <p>Tracy suggested Dave is raising an important point. We might start seeing a pattern. She wondered if we should establish a formal process for making decision based on poverty rates? Heather suggested this would be difficult to formalize. She didn't feel much has changed since last year.</p> <p>Stephanie suggested we consider the academic data in conjunction with the F&R Meals data to determine if Paxson should be funded. Heather thought we would have to use achievement data for all schools, which could add another level of complexity to the data, thus adding more subjectivity to the decision-making.</p> <p>Heather asked for each attendee's feelings about exploring the inclusion of Paxson in Title I funding. Brian, Wendy, Lori, Joy, Erica, Julie, Stephanie, Leslie, Shannan and Amanda all suggested sticking with the numbers we have. Tara and Matt abstained. Tracy asked who would be making the final the decision. Heather explained we would go through the same feedback process we went through last year to include feedback from the Standing Committee, Meeting of Practitioners, Superintendent's Cabinet and the Board of Trustees. Dave and Tracy would like Heather to share budgets with and without Paxson at the Meeting of Practitioners and ask for group feedback.</p> <p>Wendy mentioned that Porter is 10 percentage points away from Paxson. She asked if Paxson could receive schoolwide funding?</p> <p>Julie also wondered if Paxson would be schoolwide or targeted. The threshold for schoolwide is 40% so Paxson would be schoolwide.</p> <p>Julie asked about how the changes of school boundaries could affect Title I. Heather suggested those changes are years down the road.</p> <p>Heather asked the group if everyone approves of the inclusion of a budget that includes Paxson. This budget would be presented with the other budgets to the Title I teams at the Meeting of Practitioners. Everyone in attendance agreed. Heather indicated that Kelly Chumrau, Paxson Principal would love to have Title I services at Paxson. Heather is fine with allowing the teams at the Meeting of Practioners to make that recommendation.</p> <p>The group reviewed the K-8 preliminary budget [change FINAL to Preliminary].</p>
--	--

	<p>Heather explained that the AYP school choice is a 10% required set-aside. AYP (Annual Yearly Progress) provides school choice when a school is not meeting AYP. Some parents choose to send their student to a different school. Most of these funds are not used and can be re-allocated after February 2015. The funds will be used to support salaries for FRC coordinators.</p> <p>SES (Supplemental Educational Services) is a required 10% set-aside. We are anticipating not spending \$50,000 of the SES funds. These funds will be re-allocated to buildings in February 2015 to use for professional development, after school or summer school activities.</p> <p>The Homeless allocation is based on the number of FIT students (77) in non-Title I buildings multiplied by the per pupil amount. We utilize this set-aside to support the FIT coordinators in the non-Title I buildings.</p> <p>The Neglected & Delinquent allocation is determined the same way as the homeless set-aside, but that number comes from the state.</p> <p>Administrative costs - Heather explained we will re-structure the Title I office to include two federal project coordinators and will no longer have a secretary. One federal projects coordinator will focus on FIT and N&D and one will focus on Title I programming.</p> <p>Parent involvement is a required set-aside and is used in the buildings and at the district level.</p> <p>Professional Development is a 10% required set-aside and these funds are used to support the instructional coaches.</p> <p>The DIBELS budget is for using DIBELS on iPads so teachers can obtain instant student achievement data.</p> <p>SuccessMaker is a highly effective computer- and evidence-based reading and math intervention. The costs associated with maintaining SuccessMaker in the Title I K-8 buildings is paid for by the district. Heather mentioned that we are considering purchasing SuccessMaker licenses for non-Title I schools to support FIT students in lieu of the current tutoring program. Dave asked for a presentation.</p> <p>Heather reviewed the school enrollment data. This is all based on February data.</p> <p>Dave asked for an explanation of the Per Student Amount formula. Heather explained it is based on the Total F&R numbers and the balance after required set-asides and district expenses are subtracted. The F&R total for Title I schools is divided into the balance.</p> <p>Heather emphasized we always give as much as possible to the buildings. Heather explained we try to keep the per pupil allocation to buildings as an equal distribution. It is a careful balancing act. Lowell is taking a decrease this year because their number</p>
--	--

	<p>of students decreased. If we increase the yellow band of poverty, it increases Franklin but decreases other schools.</p> <p>The high school budget reflects the removal of Hellgate. The Homeless and N&D numbers include Hellgate as a non-Title I school.</p> <p>Tracy wondered if Big Sky will have a full-time FRC coordinator. Heather said that will be up to Big Sky.</p>
7:10 – 7:20	<p>Identify next meeting date – Heather Davis Schmidt</p> <p>Scheduled May 21 for next meeting. Heather will send a new calendar invitation to everyone.</p>
7:20-7:30	<p>Closing and next steps</p> <p>Exit Ticket</p> <p>Next meeting date: May 21, 2014, 6:00 to 7:30 PM</p>

Exit Ticket Responses:

Stars (Compliments) – What is working well with the Title I programs? (Organized based on consistent themes):

Interventions/Instructional Strategies

1. Increased/targeted small group instruction for intensive/strategic students
2. Reading intervention classes building students fundamental reading skills at Hellgate.
3. Utilizing learning tools to assist identified students catch up to “grade level” in weak areas of learning.
4. Development of multi-tiered systems of support, braided initiative.
5. Summer school programs for K&1
6. The dedicated Title I coordinator and FRC staff at Hellgate High School; as well as CSP at Hawthorne.
7. Providing needed services.

Technology

8. Technology (Apple products and SuccessMaker)
9. Filling gaps with programs such as SuccessMaker.
10. SuccessMaker.

FRC/FIT Coordinators

11. I am happy with the addition of the FIT coordinators.
12. FRCs.
13. Helping FIT students.

Professional Development

14. Professional development
15. Targeted professional development.

Assorted Comments

16. I appreciate revisiting budgets and analyzing how decisions are made.
17. Open communication for input is always important.

18. Please maintain activities bus; it's essential for our Title I students who have to travel so far to our feeder schools, particularly Lowell [students].

Stairs (Critiques) – What improvements or changes are needed to the Title I programs? (Organized based on consistent themes):

Improve the system for identifying Title I eligibility and meeting academic needs:

1. I would advocate for more critical thinking in regard to students and schools that could benefit from Title services. Could there be a way to serve more students in need in the district? Could Graduation Matters play a role?
2. A more accurate measure of poverty is needed in the high schools than F&R forms. DOE, OPI and Title recognize the inaccuracy of F&R and provide alternative means of calculations. Open enrollment is an argument for Feeder Pattern rather than against it.
3. Continue to advocate for students in the lower edges; even if the F&R forms don't get turned in.
4. Evaluate schools on the cusp (Paxson).
5. Ensuring that the schools with the most need academically (based on F&R numbers) are supported with services/funds.
6. Determination of thresholds.

Funding

7. More money, of course.
8. More funding to teacher time.

Assorted Comments

9. Interventions through Flagship and before school.
10. McKinney-Vento tutoring model.
11. Better scheduling of Title I coaches.
12. More PD on instructional technology and best practices for incorporating.

Share (Gifting) – What resources should we utilize to enhance Title I programming?

1. Graduation Matters? Could it be brought to elementary schools?
2. Feeder Pattern.
3. Training for our regular education staff so they can teach to the edges.
4. Insuring students' strengths are identified to increase ability to learn and gain confidence to increase success.
5. More money for FRC and FIT programs.
6. Teachers having more time to share with other Title I teachers.
7. Loved the video and the message it had to offer.
8. Good job at present.
9. I'll think about it ☺.